arXiv:quant-ph/9812024v1 12 Dec 1998

TSQT 'Elements of Possibility'?

R.E. Kastner*

Department of Philosophy

University of Maryland

College Park, MD 20742 USA.

December 10, 1998

Abstract

I defend my arguments in quant-ph/9806002, which have recently been criticized by L. Vaidman (quant-ph/9811092). I emphasize that the correct usage of the ABL rule applies not to a genuine counterfactual statement but rather to a conjunction of material conditionals. I argue that the only kind of valid counterfactual statement one can make using the ABL rule is a "might" counterfactual, which is not adequate for the attribution of 'elements of reality' to a quantum system.

Lev Vaidman (1998) claims that I am "distorting" his assertions (Kastner 1998). He suggests that I am trying to "find something beyond [these claims]," i.e., about values of observables or hidden variables, which he has not made. Yet the title of a 1987 paper of which he is first author is: "How to Ascertain the Values of σ_x, σ_y, and σ_z of a Spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Particle" (Vaidman, Aharonov, and Albert, 1987). Moreover, in that article he refers to other "curious *properties* of a quantum system within time intervals between two experiments" (my italics), as presented by Albert, Aharonov, and D'Amato (1985). The latter paper, as noted in my article, uses an explicitly *bona fide* (in my sense) counterfactual reading of the ABL rule to support the claim that an appropriately pre- and post-selected system could have "definite, dispersion-free values" of non-commuting sets of observables. These claims about dispersion-free values of observables and curious properties of a system between measurements are certainly ontological claims, and I believe I am fully justified

*rkastner@wam.umd.edu

in treating them as such in my paper. (However, it should be noted that none of the arguments in my paper rely on a hidden variables interpretation of quantum mechanics, i.e., a modal interpretation such as Bohm's.)

In any case, Vaidman's claim that what I identify as the non-counterfactual reading of the ABL rule—my "first reading"—*is* in fact counterfactual, cannot be maintained. Here is the syntactical form of that reading:

(If P_1 then Q_1) and (if P_2 then Q_2) and (if P_3 then Q_3) and (if....) and (if P_N then Q_N),

where each P_i is "A measurement of observable i was performed", and each Q_i is "the probability of outcome x_i was $p(x_i)$."

This is clearly and unambiguously a conjunction of material conditionals, not a counterfactual statement. Applying this to a measurement context, if only one of the N observables—say observable k—is measured, then only one of the material conditionals has a true antecedent; all the others have false antecedents and are only vacuously true. As Mermin (1997) says in regard to a list of possible outcomes obtained from the ABL rule for a time-symmetrized system, the outcomes on the list corresponding to conjuncts with false antecedents are "rubbish–they have nothing to do with anything."[1]

Nevertheless, Vaidman wishes to call the other outcomes "elements of reality," so he evidently does not consider them rubbish. The argument apparently is that, by "fixing" the system's two-state vector, the other conjuncts can be considered applicable to the same system. However, the only way it can make any sense to "hold fixed" the system's states at t_1 and t_2 is to talk about some *other* possible (i.e., non-actual) world j in which the counterfactual measurement *is* performed and the system *happens* to end up with the same two-state vector as in i. But then all we are saying is that there is *some* possible antecedent-world in which the system has the same two-state vector; we can make no claim that the two-state vector is fixed for *all* the closest possible antecedent-worlds, as

[1] Mermin (1997, p. 151).

required . [2]

In this case, the only kind of counterfactual statement one can make is a "might" counterfactual rather than a "would" counterfactual. This is a statement like

If I were to strike this match, it might light.

For the 'might' counterfactual, it is not required that the necessary background conditions hold throughout the closest antecedent-permitting sphere, but merely at *some* possible world in the closest antecedent-permitting sphere. But this, of course, is a much weaker, essentially empty counterfactual. Outcomes obtained from such a 'might' counterfactual would not merit the term "elements of reality"; the most one could say is that they are "elements of possibility."[3]

Finally, I would note that Vaidman's "...most convincing example that the term counterfactual is appropriate", referring to an example discussed in his (1997), was also discussed, but rather differently, in his (1996). In that paper, he notes (p.903) that "we cannot see this 'reality' for one particle because the uncertainty of the appropriate weak measurement has to be much larger than 1...", but in his reply (1998) and in his (1997) he seems to suggest that the weak-measurement elements of reality apply to a *single* particle. This point is exactly what is under dispute.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jeffrey Bub, Jerry Finkelstein, Charles Hagelgans, Jim Malley, and Lev Vaidman for useful discussions and/or correspondence.

[2]That is, unless we arbitrarily designate all worlds with the required two-state vector as consituting all the closest antecedent-worlds. (Vaidman has indicated in a private correspondence that this is in fact what he has in mind.) But, to borrow a term from Bennett, this is certainly "*ad hoc* gerrymandering" (1984, p. 62). Similarity of worlds is properly based on comparative possibility, not the accidental similarity of individual facts such as having the same two-state vector; this is not classical dogma but a very general and intuitive way to understand similarity of possible worlds. (See Lewis 1973, e.g. p. 52). Finkelstein (1998) also does not consider the antecedent-worlds in which the system has the same outcome at t_2 as in the actual world to be closer to the actual world than the antecedent-worlds in which the t_2 outcome differs. Moreover, Kvart's analysis of cotenability as requiring a lack of negative causal relevance between the antecedent and background conditions supports my assertion that "fixing" the two-state vector in order to obtain a "would" counterfactual violates cotenability (see Kvart 1986, e.g. p.xii).

[3]This notion of "element of possibility", however, is very weak. For instance, it would appear to have no special significance as regards to dispositional properties of a system.

References

Albert, D.Z., Aharonov, Y., and D'Amato, S. (1985), *Physical Review Letters 54*, 5.

Bennett, J. (1984), 'Counterfactuals and Temporal Direction,' *The Philosophical Review XCIII*, p. 57.

Finkelstein, J. (1998), 'Space-Time Counterfactuals,' Los Alamos preprint, quant-ph/9811057.

Kastner, R.E. (1998), 'Time-Symmetrized Quantum Theory, Counterfactuals, and "Advanced Action"', forthcoming in *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, Los Alamos preprint quant-ph/9806002.

Kvart, I. (1986), *A Theory of Counterfactuals*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co.

Lewis, D. (1973), *Counterfactuals*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mermin, N. D. (1997), 'How to Ascertain the Values of Every Member of a Set of Observables That Cannot All Have Values,' in R. S. Cohen et al. (eds), *Potentiality, Entanglement and Passion-at-a-Distance*, 149-157, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vaidman, L. (1996),'Weak-Measurement Elements of Reality,' *Foundations of Physics 26*, p.895.

Vaidman, L. (1997), 'Time Symmetrized Counterfactuals in Quantum Theory,' Los Alamos preprint quant-ph/9807075.

Vaidman, L. (1998), 'Defending Time-Symmetrized Quantum Counterfactuals,' Los Alamos preprint quant-ph/9811092.

Vaidman, Aharonov, and Albert (1987), 'How to Ascertain the Values of σ_x, σ_y, and σ_z pf a Spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Particle,' *Phys Rev Lett 58*, 1385.